

"No" on rollcall No. 587—Ordering the previous question on H. Res 305;

"Yes" on rollcall No. 588—Motion to table the motion to reconsider the vote on the previous question;

"Yes" on rollcall No. 589—Agreeing to H. Res 305, waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and for other purposes;

"Yes" on rollcall No. 590—Motion to table the motion to reconsider H. Res 305;

"No" on rollcall No. 591—Motion to adjourn;

"Yes" on rollcall No. 592—Agreeing to H. Res 188, urging the executive branch to take action regarding the acquisition by Iran of C-802 cruise missiles;

"Yes" on rollcall No. 593—Motion to table the motion to reconsider H. Res 188;

"No" on rollcall No. 594—Motion to adjourn;

"Yes" on rollcall No. 595—On passage of H.R. 967 to prohibit the use of United States funds to provide for the participation of certain Chinese officials in international conferences, programs, and activities and to provide that certain Chinese officials shall be ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission to the United States;

"Yes" on rollcall No. 596—Motion to table the motion to reconsider;

"No" on rollcall No. 597—Motion to adjourn.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2264,
DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 8, 1997

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the fiscal year 2000 \$300 million advance funding level for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting contained in this bill. That is a \$50 million increase over the comparable appropriation for fiscal year 1999, an amount which only partially offsets the three consecutive years of rescission of public broadcasting funds. The American public has sent a clear message to Congress that it supports a public broadcasting system.

The House appropriations report concerning CPB funding specifically supports the commitment made by CPB in 1994 to formalize partnerships among the organizations of the National Minority Public Broadcasting Consortia, television stations, and other public broadcasting organizations to maximize resources to increase the amount of multicultural programming on public television. That 1994 agreement was over a year in the making, but unfortunately, it has never received any funding.

I trust that the \$50 million increase will make it possible to fund the Principles of Partnership Initiative, and would encourage CPB to see if they can find fiscal year 1998 and fiscal year 1999 funds to get this initiative of collaboration underway.

The Minority Consortia organizations—Pacific Islanders in Communications, National Black Programming Consortium, National Latino Communications Center, National Asian

American Telecommunications Association, Native American Public Telecommunications—have provided public broadcasting's program schedule hundreds of hours of programming addressing the cultural, social, and economic issues of the country's racial and ethnic communities. Additionally, each consortium has been engaged in cultivating ongoing relationships with the independent minority producers community by providing program funding, programming support, and distribution assistance. They also provide numerous hours of programming to individual public television and radio stations.

I would like to point out that the newest consortia member, Pacific Islanders in Communications, is headquartered in Hawaii and has already had major responsibility for several award winning public broadcast productions, notably Storytellers of the Pacific which was coproduced with Native American Public Telecommunications, and And Then There Were None.

I look forward to an increasingly productive partnership between public broadcasting and the National Minority Public Broadcasting organizations and the communities they represent.

A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE
LOAN CONSOLIDATION PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 8, 1997

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to report on the progress of the Department of Education's loan consolidation program. Because of the solid efforts of the Department and EDS, the program is on track to complete all the pending consolidation applications and to resume accepting new applications by December 1, 1997.

As of September 15, 1997, EDS had received 142,856 consolidation applications. Of that number, 84,078 were still pending. In less than 2 months, the outstanding inventory has been reduced by 81 percent; only 15,607 applications are still pending. As a result, the number of completed consolidations has increased by 64 percent since mid-September.

These updated figures show that the loan consolidation problems no longer exist. The Department's loan consolidation program streamlines the borrowing process, reduces financial costs, and improves access to education for students and their families. The Department and EDS are to be commended for their swift response to the situation and for putting this important program back on track.

HELPING EMPOWER LOW-INCOME
PARENTS [HELP] SCHOLARSHIPS
AMENDMENTS OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1997

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 2746, the HELP Scholarships Program. I am a strong advocate for public

schools and I believe we must work to ensure that all children, regardless of race, religion, income, or social status, have an opportunity to receive the best education possible in our public schools. We should not jeopardize that opportunity with an ill-conceived plan to provide tax dollars to private schools.

If we are to improve public education in this country, we must take positive steps. I believe the principles outlined in the Democratic plan provide the foundation for those steps. We have focused on six goals: First, early childhood development—basics by age six; second, well-trained teachers; third, relief for crumbling and overcrowded schools, and well-equipped classrooms; fourth, support for local plans to renew neighborhood public schools; fifth, efficient and coordinated use of resources; and sixth, parental choices for public schools.

These goals seem to be simple common sense. They provide the basis for a quality, public education for all students. If we, as Members of Congress, unite behind these goals, we can make great strides in our quest to improve public education. In our great country, everyone is guaranteed the right to a free, public education. It is our duty to ensure that a public education is consistently a quality education.

The increasing competitiveness of our global economy requires that our young people be better educated than ever before in our history. Our schools must provide adequate training in the basic skills needed to succeed in the current and future job market. We must ensure that all of our students have access to an education that prepares them to survive in a global economy. The Democratic plan places us firmly on that path.

Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today will help only a few children fortunate enough to meet the criteria to attend private schools. This bill provides no real choice to students or parents. It does nothing for the vast majority of the nation's students. Only a few lucky students could take advantage of the program given the low funding level for the title VI program under which the vouchers would be provided.

The Republican plan might provide more opportunity to a few select lower income students, but what about the rest? What about the students that private schools don't want? We cannot require private schools to admit all students. This bill affords no civil rights protections to the students in the voucher program. Schools accepting vouchers do not have to accept children who need high-cost education because they are disabled, have limited English proficiency, or are homeless. When we provide public funds to these schools, we resurrect the misguided concept of "separate but equal."

In addition to the problems presented by diverting public money into private schools, I believe it is important to point out that it is a clear violation of the first amendment doctrine of separation of church and state to provide public money to private, religious schools. This bill explicitly permits Federal funds to be used for sectarian activities. Such provisions are clearly contrary to the provision of the first amendment prohibiting the establishment of religion. The Supreme Court has consistently held that tax dollars cannot pay, directly or indirectly, for religious education or the religious mission of parochial schools. If we adopt this